DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 051 443 AC 008 140

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Nixon, R. A. |
| TITLE | Legislative Dimensions of the New Careers Program: 1970. |
| INSTITUTION | New York Univ., N.Y. Center for the Study of the Unemployed. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Ofice of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development. |
| PUB DATE | 70 |
| NOTE | 33p. |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Career Planning, *Employment Opportunities, *Federal Legislation |

ABSTRACT

Plans for the development of New Careers nonprofessional public service employment are now a major element in all manpower and human service programs. This new stage in the developing New Careers program is defined by a variety of factors. Specific New Careers program amendments were added in 1968 to the various laws enacted by the 90th Congress. Major new administrative actions have been taken to extend and apply New Careers manpower and human service concepts. The Department of Labor has announced a new manpower program. In some still pending legislation, the New Careers program will need to be added. Legislation enacted so far and described in this booklet relates to economic opportunity, all levels of education, health, welfare, government employment, and general manpower. It is concluded that legislative opportunities for advancing the New Careers program are numerous and great. The variety of the legislative areas to which the New Careers program relates gives a great opportunity for increased appreciation and application of the program. (CK)

**New York University**
Graduate School of Social Work
Alex Rosen, Dean

•

**Center For Study of The Unemployed**
Stanley Sadofsky, Technical Director
William C. Lawrence, Administrative Director

•

853 Broadway
New York, New York 10003

ED051443

# LEGISLATIVE DIMENSIONS OF THE NEW CAREERS PROGRAM: 1970

by
R. A. Nixon

School of Social Work
Columbia University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

This publication, revised and updated from the original 1967 edition, was produced as part of a project conducted by the N.Y.U. Center for Study of the Unemployed with the support of a grant from the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to develop curriculum materials for program planners and operators.

1970

## TABLE OF CONTENTS


**INTRODUCTION** . . . . . 5

**LEGISLATION** . . . . . 8

I. Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 . . . . . 8
- 1966 Amendments . . . . . 8
- 1967 Amendments . . . . . 9
- 1969 Amendments . . . . . 10

II. Education . . . . . 15
- Higher Education Act Amendments of 1967 . . . . . 15
- Elementary & Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967 . . . . . 16
- Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968 . . . . . 19

III. Law Enforcement, Corrections & Juvenile Delinquency . . . 21
- Omnibus Crime Control & Safe Streets Act of 1968 . . . . 21
- Juvenile Delinquency Prevention & Control Act of 1968 . . . 22
- Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969 . . . . . 23

IV. Health . . . . . 24
- Health Manpower Act of 1968 . . . . . 24
- Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966 . . . . . 24
- Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1968 . . . . 25

V. Welfare . . . . . 26
- Social Security Amendments of 1967 . . . . . 26
- Work Incentive Program (WIN) . . . . . 26
- Family Assistance Act . . . . . 27
- Child Care Legislation . . . . . 28

VI. Government Employment . . . . . 29
- Intergovernmental Personnel Act . . . . . 29
- Federal Government Employment Opportunity Act . . . . . 30
- Public Service Employment Opportunity Act . . . . . 30
- Public Service Careers Program . . . . . 31

VII. General Manpower Legislation . . . . . 32
- President Nixon's Manpower Program . . . . . 32
- O'Hara Bill: "The Manpower Act" . . . . . 32

**CONCLUSION** . . . . . 34


ED021423

## INTRODUCTION

At the beginning of 1970 — after three years of experimentation and implementation of the 1966 Scheuer New Careers amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act — it is clear that plans for the development of New Careers nonprofessional public service employment are now a major element in all manpower and human service programs. This new stage in the developing New Careers program is defined by a variety of factors:

1. Specific New Careers amendments were added in 1968 to the Vocational Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, and Juvenile Delinquency legislation enacted by the 90th Congress.

2. Major new administrative actions have been taken to extend and apply New Careers manpower and human service concepts. In the Department of Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Finch has established a Departmental Office of New Careers and the Office of Education has activated a major New Careers orientated Educational Professions Development program. In a number of states, notably Hawaii, California, Oregon and Washington, steps have been taken to apply New Careers in state employment. Numerous municipalities are taking similar action.

3. The Department of Labor has announced a new manpower program, the Public Service Careers Program, to continue the Scheuer projects and add New Careers concepts to federal, state, county and local government employment programs.

4. The House of Representatives and the Senate have approved a two-year extension of the Scheuer New Careers provision as a part of OEO extension. The House and Senate Labor Committee **Reports** express strong reaffirmation of support for New Careers. The House Labor Committee authorized a doubling of New Careers funds.

5. In varying fashions and degrees of specificity, New Careers concepts and career development principles are included in the Administration's Manpower and Welfare proposals, and in the Democratic sponsored O'Hara and Nelson manpower and anti-poverty bills. Numerous other pending human service bills with manpower components include or are developing New Careers-type provisions.

6. Although still in its experimental and demonstration phase, New Careers has now had two years of application, and initial and tentative evaluations and result analyses have been made. This experience has had the sobering effect of emphasizing the problems and barriers to full realization of effective New Careers programs. At the same time, this early experience has confirmed the essential validity and high value of New Careers. Encouraging initiative and flexibility has been

demonstrated by both individuals and institutions, and the capacity, motivation, and potential of New Careers workers have been established beyond question.

It is in this dynamic setting, full of both problems and promise, that the revised **Legislative Dimensions of the New Careers Program**, updated to 1970, is presented.

### The Background and Prospects of New Careers

The initial vitality and the enormous potential of the New Careers program was based on the confluence of the following powerful socio-economic trends which still apply:

1. The shifting emphasis of our economy from the private to the public sector with education, health, and other public services becoming the fastest growing "industries."
2. The great and increasing need for manpower and the concomitant desperate shortage of professionals in public service.[1]
3. The stubborn continuation of a large volume of unemployment with a hard core of jobless concentrated in the disadvantaged population, and the long-range problem of providing "jobs for all" in our changing economy.
4. The militancy of the Civil Rights movement, leading to increased demands for decent employment opportunities, dignity, and improved social services for Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Mexican Americans, and other minorities.
5. A new appreciation, growing out of the philosophy and the experiences of manpower and anti-poverty programs of the 1960's, of the feasibility and great potential of the poor's participation and their constructive contribution in our society. This encompasses rejection of the idea that "dead end" menial jobs are suitable for the poor.
6. A mood — and even necessity — to innovate and experiment with new methods of training and teaching, of manpower utilization, and of organization and development in our social and economic relations.

The use of non-professionals as auxiliary personnel assisting professionals is not new. There have been many precedents especially during World War II, and more recently in scattered experimental and demonstration projects. But in 1964 with the enactment of the Economic Opportunity Act and its emphasis on participation of the poor, and on the provision of

1. The Report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, **Technology and the American Economy**, February 1966, p. 36, estimates that there is a potential of 5.3 million new public service jobs.

both services and jobs for the poverty population, the New Careers program began to jell. In 1965 the publication by Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman of **New Careers for the Poor**[2] gave currency and direction to the program. Concurrently, experimental and demonstration projects for the use of non-professionals began to multiply under the sponsorship of the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and the Welfare Division of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, the Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation and Research of the Labor Department, and in a variety of correctional and law enforcement agencies throughout the country. More than 25,000 non-professionals were employed by the Office of Economic Opportunity in its Community Action Program.[3]

Then, in the 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act, a new program was authorized (Title II, Section 205(e) ) to prepare unemployed or low-income persons to enter career jobs in public service as nonprofessional personnel. This program, sponsored by Congressman James H. Scheuer (D-New York), is known as the Scheuer Program.

It is with this background that we have found significant recognition of the potential of nonprofessional employment in a variety of reports, messages and statements by both Presidents Johnson and Nixon, by various National Commissions, and by major public officials. Paralleling these messages, bills have been introduced in Congress and major legislation has been enacted which either specifically provide for nonprofessional programs, or clearly open the door to Executive implementation of such provisions. This paper outlines these legislative developments. It illustrates the possible dimensions of new Congressional enactments, and the significantly widened role being assigned to the development of nonprofessional careers in public service.[4]

In some still pending legislation, the New Careers program will need to be added, as the Scheuer amendment was added to the originally proposed 1966 Amendments, to the Economic Opportunity Act. In other legislation the tentative and limited New Careers proposals need further definition and expansion. These further legislative steps can be expected to confirm the enhanced status of the New Careers Program made clear by the legislative developments described in this paper.

2. **Arthur Pearl and Frank Riessman, New Careers for the Poor: The Nonprofessional in Human Service, the Free Press, New York, 1965.**

3. **A study of such programs in nine cities employing about 5000 nonprofessionals by Daniel Yankelovich, Inc. states: "The program is now operationally viable. . . . A large number of previously unemployed or underemployed poor people without background or training for the kind of work they are now doing, have been routinely hired, have received some training and are working hard and enthusiastically on their jobs. After some months of experience, supervisory personnel supervising professionals and agency personnel in the CAA feel that the nonprofessionals are filling an indispensable role rather well."**
**A Study of the Non-Professional in the CAP prepared for Office of Economic Opportunity by Daniel Yankelovich, Inc. September, 1966, p. 15.**

4. **An excellent detailed summary of all the possibilities for funding and linkage of New Careers programs to existing legislation has been prepared by the New York University New Careers Development Center in Richard Gould's "Guide to Funding New Careers Programs."**

## LEGISLATION

### I. ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

#### 1966 Amendments

The 1966 Amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act included the following addition to the section of Title II on "Community Action — Adult Work Training and Employment Programs":

> The Director is authorized to make grants or enter into agreements with any State or local agency or private organization to pay all or part of the costs of adult work training and employment programs for unemployed or low-income persons involving activities designed to improve the physical, social, economic or cultural condition of the community or areas served in fields including, but not limited to, health, education and welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety. Such programs shall (1) assist in developing entry level employment opportunities, (2) provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, and (3) be combined with necessary educational, training, counseling, and transportation assistance, and such other supportive services as may be needed. Such work experience shall be combined, where needed with educational and training assistance, including basic literacy and occupational training. Such programs shall be conducted in a manner consistent with policies applicable under this Act for the protection of employed workers and the maintenance of basic rates of pay and other suitable conditions of employment.

This Amendment was sponsored by Congressman Scheuer who, on March 1, 1966 had introduced HR 13159, "The Career Opportunity Act" which proposed an Amendment to the EOA "to provide employment opportunities for unemployed, low-income persons in sub-professional service careers." This original Scheuer Bill emphasized the objectives of "providing new permanent jobs with career potential," and would have authorized $1,360,000,000 to carry out the program during fiscal year 1967.

While this original New Careers bill was not enacted, Congressman Scheuer, as a member of the Antipoverty Subcommittee of the House Committee on Education and Labor, did succeed in having the Committee add the New Careers Program to the Amendments proposed by the Administration. In the Committee's **Report on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966,** the Scheuer New Careers Amendment was referred to jointly with the 1965 Nelson Amendment (named after its sponsor, Sen. Gaylord Nelson, D-Wisc., and which provided conservation and community beautification employment for elderly poor people) as part of the "Public Service Employment Training Program." The report stated:

> The Nelson Amendment, as it now stands, is too limited in the scope of the activities it supports, and the size of the program it envisions to reduce substantially the many who are hard-core unemployed. The Committee has, therefore, recommended a new amendment specifically designed to enable chronically unemployed individuals to secure entry positions other than as professionals in the public service sector of the economy with built-in opportunities for training and experience. Hopefully, these opportunities will lead to promotion and advancement. The outlines of this program were first presented by Cong. James Scheuer.[5]

5. United States Congress, House of Representatives Report No. 1568, Committee on Education and Labor, **Report on Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1966,** June 1, 1966, p. 10.

The Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1966, including the Scheuer Amendment, passed the House on September 29, 1966 and were accepted by the Senate on October 4, 1966. They became law on November 8, 1966, with the President's signature. Congress appropriated $73 million for the Nelson and the Scheuer programs and subsequently approximately $33 million was allocated to the new Scheuer program. In December, 1966 administration of the Scheuer program was delegated to the Department of Labor, Manpower Administration, Bureau of Work Programs by the Director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Guidelines for the Scheuer New Careers Program were issued on February 24, 1967 by the Secretary of Labor as part of the "Standards and Procedures for Work-Training Experience Programs under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, as Amended."[6] The program is being implemented by the Manpower Administrator, Department of Labor, with the OEO Community Action Agencies as developers and sponsors of the resultant New Careers projects.

### 1967 Amendments

The 1967 Economic Opportunity Act Amendments continued the Scheuer New Careers Program until June 20, 1969, and this legislation has been extended pending final Congressional action extending OEO for another two years and strengthened in its New Careers language. Whereas the 1966 program was limited to adults over 21 years of age, the new Scheuer program includes adults and youths age sixteen and over. In the 1967 Amendment the OEO Director is authorized to fund special work and training programs . . .

> which provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or areas served in fields including without limitation health, education and welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement.

Both the House Committee on Education and Labor and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare in their Reports on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967 reaffirmed and emphasized the special features of the New Careers program. The House **Report** stated:

> The need to create new careers with advancement opportunities was additionally stressed in the 'new careers' program. The committee notes that 'new careers' projects have been funded which provide only the most superficial attention to the career ladder concept or to the requirement that permanent jobs be available at the end of training.

6. These guidelines also apply to the Neighborhood Youth Corps, the Kennedy-Javits Special Impact Program, and the Nelson "Community Employment and Betterment Program." New guidelines, which substantially tightened the quality controls and standards of the New Careers program, were issued on Jan. 3, 1968 by the Labor Department.

The committee expects the Labor Department to act decisively in correcting these situations.[7]

The 1967 Senate Labor Committee **Report** stated:

The new careers program is too new for evaluation. However, the committee notes that while the early emphasis is upon training, which is proper, it appears that not enough attention is being given to assuring that 'new careers' jobs, paid by other funds, will be available at the completion of training. It will not be easy to break down traditional barriers, such as civil service regulations and professional 'standards,' which block the disadvantaged from moving into public service occupations, but considerable effort must be made in this regard if the program is to succeed.[8]

## 1969 Amendments

In 1969 Congress lagged in its extension of the Economic Opportunity Act, but on December 12, the House of Representatives approved the bipartisan supported two-year extension of the anti-poverty legislation. Significantly, the only changes in the existing OEO law were a repositioning of the Mainstream and New Careers programs enhancing their importance. The Senate had approved a similar OEO extension on Oct. 14, 1969. During the House and Senate hearings, a "New Careers Panel" presented statements describing the problems and the accomplishments of the initial period of Scheuer program operation. Members of that panel included Dr. Russell A. Nixon of Columbia University, Dr. Frank Riessman of New York University, Dr. Jacob Fishman of Howard University and the University Research Corporation, Dr. Joseph Paige of the Detroit Urban Adult Education Institute, and Mr. Charles Jackson, Director of the Oakland, California New Careers program.

The House changed the OEO legislation to add to the "Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969" Title II — "Special Work and Career Development Programs." This adds an additional Part E to the "Work Training and Work-Study Programs" (Title I) of the Economic Opportunity Act. While no substantive changes are made in the language of the law, the emphasis on New Careers is significant. The new section now reads:

**TITLE I**
**WORK TRAINING AND WORK-STUDY PROGRAMS**

**Part E — Special Work and Career Development Programs**
**Statement of Purpose**

Sec. 161. The Congress finds that the "Operation Mainstream" program aimed primarily at the chronically unemployed and the "New Careers" program providing jobs for the unemployed and low-income persons leading to broader career opportunities are uniquely effective; that, in addition to providing persons assisted with jobs, the key to their economic independence, these programs are of advantage to the community at large in that they are directed at community beautification and betterment

7. United States Congress, House of Representatives Report No. 866, Committee on Education and Labor, **Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967**, October 27, 1967, pp. 17-18.

8. United States Congress, Senate Report No. 563, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, **Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1967**, Sept. 12, 1967 p. 25.

and the improvement of health, education, welfare, public safety, and other public services; and that, while these programs are important and necessary components of comprehensive work and training programs, there is a need to encourage imaginative and innovative use of these programs, to enlarge the authority to operate them, and to increase the resources available for them.

**Special Programs**

Sec. 162. (a) The Director is authorized to provide financial assistance to public or private nonprofit agencies to stimulate and support efforts to provide the unemployed with jobs and the low-income worker with greater career opportunity. Programs authorized under this section shall include the following:

(1) A special program to be known as "Mainstream" which involves work activities directed to the needs of those chronically unemployed poor who have poor employment prospects and are unable, because of age, physical condition, obsolete or inadequate skills, declining economic conditions, other causes of a lack of employment opportunity, or otherwise, to secure appropriate employment or training assistance under other programs, and which, in addition to the services provided, will enable such persons to participate in projects for the betterment or beautification of the community or area served by the program, including without limitation activities which will contribute to the management, conservation, or development of natural resources, recreational areas, Federal, State, and local government parks, highways, and other lands, the rehabilitation of housing, the improvement of public facilities, and the improvement and expansion of health, education, day care, and recreation services;

(2) A special program to be known as "New Careers" which will provide unemployed or low-income persons with jobs leading to career opportunities, including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural condition of the community or area served in fields of public service, including without limitation health, education, welfare, recreation, day care, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for on-the-job training, promotion, and advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which give promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of structuring jobs and new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement.

(b) The Director is authorized to provide financial and other assistance to insure the provision of supportive and follow-up services to supplement programs under this part including health services, counseling, day care for children, transportation assistance, and other special services necessary to assist individuals to achieve success in these programs and in employment.

The **Report**[9] of the House Committee on Education and Labor gives emphatic support and extensive attention to the New Careers program as the following **Report** excerpts indicate:

**Mainstream and New Careers**

The committee bill contains a revision in the basic manpower section of the act. Two programs which have experienced an ususually high degree of success and usefulness, "Operation Mainstream" and "New Careers" are removed from title I-B and given special, separate status in a new part E of title I. In addition, the committee, in recognition of the proven value of these two programs, has specifically earmarked $110 million for Mainstream and New Careers. This represents an increase over the President's budget of $54,700,000. It is the committee's intention that approximately $60 million be made available for Mainstream activities and approximately $50 million for New Career's activities.

9. **Economic Opportunity Act Amendments of 1969**, 91st Congress, 1st Session, House of Representatives, Report No. 91-684.

At a time when economic conditions are adversely affecting the unemployment rate, increases to these two programs, one of which provides useful jobs to those who are hopelessly unemployed and the other of which discovers and trains people for new kinds of employment, are more than just appropriate. They are mandatory . . .

**New Careers.** — The New Careers program is aimed toward meeting major public policy objectives: (1) To provide meaningful job opportunities in the existing labor market for disadvantaged persons; (2) to help meet the serious and growing shortages of manpower in the area of services, especially at the professional and technical level; and (3) to provide more effective services, especially to those who are most in need of them.

The unique essence of the New Careers program which emphasizes its importance as a demonstration program is its combination in a new way of the following components: (a) New entry routes to human service jobs for persons disadvantaged by educational training, and other "credential" limitations; (b) a new design of training and work, with special arrangements for necessary educational and supportive services; (c) redesign and restructuring of jobs based on new analysis and change in service delivery systems, so as to enhance the role of the professional and the technician in human services while making possible (d) the definition of job ladders with built-in opportunities for realistic career advancement for New Careers workers.

The New Careers program has had little more than 2 years of implementation. Because it is a career program and not just a "job" program, more time will be needed to evaluate adequately the full program accomplishment. But testimony before the committee and other available evidence has indicated several positive achievements. The demonstrated potential of hitherto excluded groups of people to make meaningful work contributions and to seek career advancement has been unquestionable. A large percentage of the enrollees entering the program have been on welfare. Training, education, and career jobs have enabled them to become self-sufficient in jobs that provide needed services to people like themselves. The New Careers program's enrollee retention rate has been high, due, in part, to the opportunity to go beyond the entry level position to jobs with more responsibility and higher salaries. This desire for self-advancement is one of the most gratifying consequences of the program. Many trainees work and go to classes full time, then spend evenings studying in spite of heavy family responsibilities. Equally gratifying are the adjustments being made by colleges — particularly community colleges — to adapt their admissions requirements, curriculums and teaching arrangements to allow easier access to new careerists wishing to take college courses toward various degrees.

Initial experience has also identified some of the barriers which must be overcome before the full potential of new careers can be realized. Limitations on New Careers in its initial stage flow from problems of implementation and funding rather than the merit of the program itself and underline the importance of continuing new careers as a developing demonstration program.

New Careers has special significance for the emphasis now being given to the provision of work alternatives for welfare recipients. The program has specifically demonstrated the potential for transfer from welfare to human service status. The job entry and job advancement features of New Careers are essential if the "work for welfare" alternative is to mean more than "dead end" jobs and meet the goal President Nixon expressed in his manpower message, "We must look at manpower training with new eyes; as a continuing process to help people to get started in a job and to get ahead in a career * * * A job is one rung on the ladder of a lifelong career of work."

The Committee has been gratified to learn of the Department of Labor's plan to expand New Careers principles into its public service Careers program relating to State and local civil services and the grant-in-aid program. Such an extension, provided the quality of the New Career opportunity is preserved, is a most desirable consequence of this demonstration program. The Committee expresses its concern, however, and warns against the danger of allowing expansion of New Careers into general manpower and public service areas in such a way as to permit dilution of the essential program features of New Careers outlined above. This has occurred in some instances where New Careers has been submerged in the general Concentrated Employment Programs. We urge the Labor Department to remedy this development. There has been some evi-

dence that New Careers funds have been diverted to non-New Careers general manpower purposes. We consider this to be a completely improper practice.

We are aware of the temptation to dimish the quality of the New Careers demonstration by adapting the cheaper route of simple entry job creation avoiding the problems of career development. In reaffirming our support of the New Careers program we reemphasize our legislative intent to mandate its full career development content and to this end we urge the Department of Labor to assure that —

1. The demonstration character of the New Careers program is clearly maintained, with full recognition that such a program with special supportive service and training involves higher costs which must be adequately funded to achieve the program quality provided by this legislation.
2. The duration of the various New Careers programs and the availability of appropriate New Careers assistance to individual trainees for continued education and training must be extended to permit full development of career potentials.
3. The guidelines governing the New Careers program are designed to eliminate any possible confusion by clearly stating the distinct status of the New Careers demonstration program. Specifically, the confusion and threat to quality programs resulting from the present CEP and non-CEP division of New Careers should be ended.
4. Additional New Careers programs are developed to maintain the growth and development of the demonstration effort.
5. Special emphasis is given to providing released time with pay for support of the training and education essential for career advancement.

We also urge the Labor Department to take steps to assure more adequate program evaluation, to provide the technical assistance required to make the program fully effective, to make the program applicable in non-urban poverty areas, and to take special steps to prepare professionals for the use and development of New Careers personnel.

The Senate Labor Committee **Report**[10] on the Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969, expressed concern over the maintenance of the quality of special manpower programs and discussed New Careers in the following terms:

It has come to the attention of the committee that a new set of guidelines is being proposed for new careers that substantially alters the original legislative intent of the program which was designed to bring low-income people into career opportunities in the human services. There are two aspects of the guidelines that are of particular concern.

One deals with the cost per enrollee which we understand has been very substantially reduced (over $1,000 per trainee). The committee is aware that the New Careers program is dealing with a constituency with serious health problems, legal and financial difficulties, and a spectrum of personal disabilities. These require expert supportive services which must be reflected in the cost per enrollee. Moreover, the wide diversity of educational deficiencies also requires a substantial remedial program, as well as specially designed course work, all of which contributes to the per enrollee cost. In addition, male heads of households have been dropping out of the program because of salary levels which currently are too low.

In the face of these known facts, the committee finds it difficult to understand how the per enrollee cost, which must include not only wages but fringe benefits, etc., can be reduced.

Secondly, the legislative intent of this program has many dimensions. Two of the most important are creating upward and lateral mobility for the new careerist, and making a New Careers program the vehicle for substantial institutional change. Yet it has come to our attention that the role of higher education would be sharply reduced

10. U.S. Congress, Senate Report 91-453, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, **Economic Opportunity Amendments of 1969**, October 10, 1969, pp. 11-12.

in the new guidelines. This change would severely limit the attainment of both objectives.

The committee's primary concern is that the Department of Labor preserve in its range of programs one of high quality that can become the vehicle for the overdue restructuring of human service agencies. New Careers has this possibility, and it is our recommendation that it be retained as a seed program with the elements of an adequate cost per enrollee, the opportunity for earning credentials in higher education, and flexibility that can reflect the varied needs of the enrollees. These elements should be firmly reflected in the guidelines.

This Congressional action in 1969 on the basic New Careers legislation, backed by the emphatic Committee **Reports**, establishes the legislative mandate for New Career programming on a new and stable level. As will be seen in the developments in other human service areas, and in the pending general manpower and welfare legislation, the spin-off from the original Scheuer amendment in 1966 has been impressive.

## II. EDUCATION

In his February 28, 1967 Message to Congress on Education and Health in America, President Johnson emphasized the critical shortage of educational manpower and said that "New kinds of school personnel — such as teacher aides — are needed to help in the schools." The President deplored the fact that "teacher aides . . . have not been eligible to participate" in Federally sponsored "programs to improve and train teachers" and urged "a broader approach to training for the education professions (and that) at the state and local level, education authorities must have greater flexibility to plan for their educational manpower needs." President Johnson recommended passage of the Education Professions Act of 1967 to, in part, "Provide new authority for the training of school administrators, teacher aides, and other education workers for schools and colleges."

**Higher Education Act Amendments of 1967:**

Simultaneously with the President's Message, on February 20, 1967, House Education and Labor Committee Chairman Perkins (D.-Ky.) and Senate Education Sub-Committee Chairman Wayne Morse (D.-Ore.) introduced H.R. 6232 and S. 1126, the "Higher Education Amendments of 1967." The legislation finally enacted on June 28, 1967 (PL 90-35) often referred to as the Education Professions Development Act added to the Higher Education Act of 1965 a new "Part D — Improving Training Opportunities for Personnel Serving in Programs of Education other than Higher Education." The Commissioner of Education is authorized to make grants to appropriate public or private agencies "for carrying out programs or projects to improve the qualifications of persons who are serving or preparing to serve in education programs in elementary and secondary schools" and in vocational education programs. Included are "programs or projects to train teacher aides and other non-professional educational personnel," and to cover "the cost of (1) short-term or regular-session institutes (and) (2) . . . seminars, symposia, workshops, or conferences . . . (that are) part of a continuing program of in-service or pre-service training." The Commissioner of Education is authorized to pay those participating in the training programs "such stipends (including allowances for subsistence and other expanses for such persons and their dependents) as he may determine, which shall be consistent with prevailing practices under comparable federally supported programs."

Also a new section titled "Attracting and Qualifying Teachers to Meet Critical Teacher Shortages" was added which provided that State plans for grants under its provisions might include "Programs of such agencies to obtain the services of teacher aides and to provide them with the pre-service training they need to perform their duties as teacher aides."

On June 20, 1967, the House Committee on Education and Labor re-

ported favorably H.R. 10943 "Amending and Extending Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965."[11] This report, as the following excerpts make clear, gave major emphasis to the development of auxiliary "New Careers" personnel in education:

The critical need for teachers continues. According to at least one nationwide survey, the need is more acute this year than it was last year. To meet this critical demand, many thousands of additional teachers and other educational personnel are needed at all levels . . . (New programs are proposed for) Grants to local educational agencies experiencing critical shortages of teachers to carry out programs to attract and qualify teachers and teacher aides. . . .

Under the provisions of the proposed new section 504, local school districts, State educational agencies, and colleges and universities will receive assistance to identify persons interested in the education profession, to encourage them to pursue an education career, whether such career would start at a professional or subprofessional level, and to publicize availability of opportunities in education.

The committee wishes to restate its interest in providing increased support of programs for the training of teacher aides. Under the proposed subpart (2) of part B of title V up to one-third of the funds may be used for programs to attract and train teacher aides. In the new proposed part D programs or projects to train teacher aides are specifically mentioned as a type of undertaking which will qualify for support. The committee cannot overstate its interest in providing support for this type of program. Equally important, however, is the training of teachers to work with teacher aides. This committee is hopeful that other training programs supported by Title V funds, though designed for other purposes, will nevertheless include a component designed to prepare teachers to work with teacher aides, particularly to develop an awareness on the part of teachers and school administrators of the advantages of using such aides in positions of increasing responsibility commensurate with training and experience.

Similarly, the Senate Committee **Report** on these 1967 amendments stressed the importance of teacher aides and of preparing teachers to work with such aides.[12]

The committee wishes to restate its interest in providing increased support of programs for the training of teacher aides. Under the proposed subpart (2) of part B of Title V up to one-third of the funds may be used for programs to attract and train teacher aides. In the new proposed part D programs or projects to train aides are specifically mentioned as a type of undertaking which will qualify for support. The committee cannot overstate its interest in providing support for this type of program. Equally important, however, is the training of teachers to work with teacher aides. An institute, or in-service training program designed for that specific purpose might qualify for support under part D. In addition to this, however, this committee is hopeful that other training programs supported by title V funds, though designed for other purposes, will nevertheless include a component designed to prepare teachers to work with teacher aides, particularly to develop an awareness on the part of teachers and school administrators of the advantages of using such aides in positions of increasing responsibility commensurate with training and experience.

### Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967:

It is estimated that in 1969, 225,000 education aides were employed under the terms of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965,

11. U.S. Congress, House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 1st Session, Report No. 373. **Amending and Extending Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965**, June 20, 1967, pp. 2, 4, and 11.

12. U.S. Congress, Senate, 90th Congress, 1st Session, Report No. 363, **Amending and Extending Title V of the Higher Education Act of 1965**, June 27, 1967, p. 9.

Title I "Assistance for the Education of Children of Low-Income Families" and Title V "Grants to Strengthen State Departments of Education."

An important extension of this legislation was suggested in a 1967 amendment proposed by Senator Gaylord Nelson (D-Wisc.). This proposal would add a new "Title VII: Teacher Aid Programs" to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Senator Nelson was joined in 1967 by Senators Clark, Pell, Muskee, and Mondale in sponsoring this proposal.

While not finally acted on, the language of this proposed teacher aid program is indicative of the Congressional approach to New Careers in education. Grants under this proposed new Title VII would be granted only if:

1. the project is designed to provide a combined program of training and experience to prepare persons to serve as teacher aides in pre-school and elementary and secondary education programs;
2. the project is part of a comprehensive program for improved utilization of educational personnel in schools where the teacher aides are to serve;
3. the project is designed to provide more individualized attention for students and to relieve teachers and other professional staff of functions which can be performed competently by teacher aides under the supervision of professional staff;
4. the institution of higher education participating in the project will undertake to provide preservice training programs to prepare persons to become teacher aides and to provide, to the extent practicable, preservice programs bringing together aides and the teachers and other educational personnel who will be supervising them;

The proposed definition of "teacher aide" in this amendment "includes assistants to teachers and also includes library aides, school recreation aides, and other ancillary educational personnel who are under the supervision of professional members of the school staff, but the term does not include persons who are primarily responsible for the instruction of pupils."

Education experts testified before the House Education and Labor Committee and the Public Welfare, seeking to strengthen the teacher aide program, particularly to increase the prospects of guaranteeing employment and upward mobility for trainees.

The Education Subcommittee of an informal New Careers Legislative Task Force comprised of representatives from Bank Street College of Education, Howard University, and the National Education Association on January 27, 1967 recommended the following amendments:

1. An Amendment to Title I of ESEA to require submission of a plan for training of auxiliary personnel and the professionals with whom they work by all school systems which request funds under this title.
2. An Amendment to the Higher Education Act to provide funds for faculty workshops on the new role of the teacher in relation to auxiliary personnel.

3. An Amendment to the ESEA and Higher Education Act to provide funds for planning, research, demonstration and evaluation of the use of auxiliary personnel in education.

The Legislative Task Force also arranged for testimony supporting such amendments. On March 15, 1967, Dr. John H. Niemeyer, President, Bank Street College of Education, and Dr. Gordon Klopf, Dean of the College, appeared before the House Education and Labor Committee. They were accompanied by Mrs. Verona Williams, an educational aide working in the New York City School system. On March 18, Dr. Garda W. Bowman, Program Coordinator of the Bank Street College of Education study of demonstration training programs for non-professionals and a leader of the Task Force also testified. The House of Representatives on May 24, 1967, approved the 1967 Amendments to ESEA with two New Careers amendments which were approved by the Senate and signed by the President on January 2, 1968. These two ESEA New Careers Amendments added in 1967 were:

1. (Proposed by Congressman Scheuer): local education agencies receiving federal funds for projects using education aides must "set forth well-developed plans providing for coordinated programs of training in which education aides and the professional staff whom they are assisting will participate together." (Section 205(a) Title II as amended).

2. (Proposed by Congressman William A. Steiger, R-Wisc.): to the State Education Agency programs which may be funded under Title V, there is added a new Section 144 "Encouragement of use of auxiliary personnel" covering projects "specifically designed to encourage the full and adequate utilization and acceptance of auxiliary personnel (such as teacher aides) in elementary and secondary schools on a permanent basis."

The House Education and Labor Committee **Report** on the ESEA amendments strongly endorsed the use of subprofessionals under the term of the Act, stating that there is "a crucial shortage of trained personnel" and that

> Training programs for professional staff in the use of teacher aides, as added by these amendments, may also contribute greatly to the fullest usage of professional skills and training. . . . the Committee hopes that the extension of the Title I authorization through fiscal year 1969 will provide sufficient assurance of program continuity to encourage States and communities to solve their manpower shortages through special training, increased use of subprofessionals and new recruitment methods.[13]

Other provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments of 1967 strengthened the mandate for innovative educational methods and manpower development to meet the needs of poor children. In the new Title VII (the "Bilingual Education Act") grants are authorized for

13. United States Congress, House of Representatives, Report No. 188, Committee on Education and Labor, **Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1967**, April 11, 1967, p. 3.

"providing preservice training designed to prepare persons to participate in bilingual education programs as teachers, teacher-aides, or other ancillary education personnel such as counselors, and inservice training and development programs to continue to improve their qualifications. . . ."

**Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968:**

An especially significant advance in New Careers legislation appeared in the Congressional action to extend and modify the federal program of vocational education. With strong bipartisan support Congress on October 3, 1968 completed action on the Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968. Besides gearing vocational education more clearly to modern job market conditions, in these Amendments Congress authorized $3,180,-050,000 for this program through fiscal year 1972 (up to June 30, 1972).

Under the primary sponsorship of Senator Ralph W. Yarborough (D-Tex.), now Chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Congress authorized grants and contracts with non-profit agencies or institutions "to encourage research and training in vocational education programs designed to meet special vocational education needs of youths and to provide education for new and emerging careers and occupations." The specifications for such new career projects were outlined in very clear terms as follows:

(6) projects in the development of New Careers and occupations, such as —
(A) research and experimental projects designed to identify new careers in such fields as mental and physical health, crime prevention and corrections, welfare, education, municipal services, child care, and recreation requiring less training than professional positions and to delineate within such careers roles with the potential for advancement from one level to another.
(B) training and development projects designed to demonstrate improved methods of securing the involvement, cooperation, and commitment of both the public and private sectors toward the end of achieving greater coordination and more effective implementation of programs for the employment of persons in the fields, including programs to prepare professionals (including administrators) to work effectively with aides, and
(C) projects to evaluate the operation of programs for the training, development, and utilization of public service aides, particularly their effectiveness in providing satisfactory work experiences and in meeting public needs.

In addition, the Senate Committee **Report** emphasized its interest in the New Careers amendment in these terms:
The committee feels that the expanding dimensions and responsibilities of vocational education should encompass research and training in new and emerging careers and occupations in public-service-connected areas. Examples of the kinds of projects which the committee feel should be funded are set forth in section 132 (6). . . .

Key to the concept set forth in this legislation is the training of students for jobs which truly are careers — employment opportunities which provide for upward mobility commensurate with training and experience. Implicit in this New Careers concept, then, is not only the training of students in public service occupations such as those set forth in clause (A), but the awakening of understanding on the part of administrators and professionals in making use of the services of nonprofessional personnel. Thus,

clause (B) provides for training and development projects designed to demonstrate improved methods of securing the involvement, cooperation, and commitment of the public and private sectors toward the end of achieving greater coordination and more effective implementation of programs for the employment of persons in less than professional positions in the public service sector.

Concomitant with its desire that the experience of the vocational education community in working in the areas of new and emerging careers and occupations be one of continual learning, the committee has included clause (C) which provides for the "evaluation of the operation of programs for the training, development, and utilization of public service aides, particularly their effectiveness in providing satisfactory work experiences and in meeting public needs."[14]

These provisions not only stress development of New Careers programs for non-professionals, but stress preparation of professionals to work in New Careers programs, and the needs to evaluate such programs.

14. United States Congress, Senate, Report No. 1386, Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, **Vocational Education Act Amendments of 1968**, July 11, 1968, p. 24.

## III. LAW ENFORCEMENT, CORRECTIONS, AND JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The serious shortage of manpower in the law enforcement and corrections field has been widely noted.[15]

One of the major means of meeting this need is increasingly recognized to be the use of auxiliary personnel. President Johnson, for example, in his Message to Congress Recommending Crime Control and Law Enforcement Legislation on February 6, 1967, suggested the police forces could be restructured "to provide for uniformed Community Service Officers. . . . these officers might not meet conventional requirements. They might have even had minor encounters with the law as teenagers. But they would know the areas and the people who live in them."

The President's commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice in its Report, **The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society,** discusses "Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Crime," and deplores the fact that "the great hopes originally held for the juvenile court have not been fulfilled. It has not succeeded significantly in rehabilitating delinquent youth." A major reason for the failure, the Commission says, is lack of personnel. Many juvenile courts have no probation services and where there is such service, lack of personnel is such that "counseling and supervision take the form of occasional phone calls and perfunctory visits . . ."[16] In its recommendations to rehabilitate delinquent youth in the community, the Commission urges intensified efforts to "Train and employ youth as sub-professional aides."[17]

The President's Commission recommended that "Probation and Parole Services should make use of volunteers and sub-professional aides in demonstration projects and regular programs." The Commission report states that non-professionals could "significantly reduce the need for fully trained officers (and) could provide positive benefits beyond that of meeting manpower shortages. People who have themselves experienced problems and come from backgrounds like those of offenders often can help them in ways professional caseworkers cannot."[18]

### Omnibus Crime Control & Safe Streets Act of 1968

After long consideration, Congress passed, and the President on June 20, 1968 signed into law the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act

15. For example, Martin Arnold, writing about the New York City Police Department, reports: "The manpower pool from which the city's police recruits traditionally are drawn is shrinking so that police officials say the department's future effectiveness is jeopardized." **New York Times,** February 14, 1967.

16. **The Challenge of Crime in a Free Society: A report by the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice** — U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., February 1967, p. 69.

17. **op. cit**

18. **Ibid,** pp. 167-8.

(PL 90-351). Included in this law were provisions aimed at recruitment and training of law enforcement officers, but no specific New Careers or non-professional manpower language was adopted. However, the provision for "community service officers" offers a wide open opportunity for New Career type auxiliary personnel development. Grants are authorized for:

The recruiting, organization and training and education of community service officers to serve with and assist in the . . . improvement of police community relations; grievance resolution mechanisms; community patrol activities; encouragement of neighborhood participation in crime prevention and public safety efforts . . . (Title I — Part C — Section 301)

The New Careers potential is clear in the laws definition of "community service officer" as "any citizen with the capacity, motivation, integrity, and stability to assist in or perform police work but who may not meet ordinary standards for employment as a regular police officer selected from the immediate locality . . ."

Other possibilities exist for New Careers development through the general manpower recruitment, training, education, research, and demonstration grants sections of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.

### Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968

On July 31, 1968, the President signed into law (PL 90-445), the 1968 Amendments to the Juvenile Delinquency and Control Act. Title II (Training) of this new legislation contains specific language concerning the implementation of the New Careers Model in the area of Juvenile Delinquency. Section 201 reads:

The Secretary is authorized, with the concurrence of the Secretary of Labor, to make grants or contracts for projects for the training of personnel employed in or preparing for employment in fields related to the diagnosis, treatment, or rehabilitation of youths who are delinquent or in danger of becoming delinquent, or for the counseling or instruction of parents in the improving and supervision of youths who are delinquent or in danger of becoming delinquent. Such projects shall include special programs which provide youth and adults with training for career opportunities, including new types of careers, in such fields. Such projects may include, among other things, development of courses of study of interrelated curriculum in schools, colleges, and universities, establishment of short-term institutes for training at such schools, colleges and universities, inservice training, and traineeships with such stipends, including allowances for travel and subsistance expenses, as the Secretary may determine to be necessary.

The Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, which added the New Careers section to the Juvenile Delinquency Law, stated:

Numerous witnesses before the committee stressed the need for more and better trained personnel in the delinquency area. The committee amendment is the same as the House-passed provisions except that the Secretary of Labor would be required to concur in the making of grants or signing of contracts for training, and that special provision is made for the training of youths and adults for New Careers in fields related to juvenile delinquency prevention and control.[19]

### Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969

On October 27, 1969, the House of Education and Labor Committee reported favorably HR 14252, the "Drug Abuse Education Act of 1969."

19. United States Congress, Senate Report No. 1332, **Juvenile Delinquency Prevention and Control Act of 1968**, June 28, 1968.

Among other things, this proposed Act would provide grants for "preservice and inservice training programs on drug abuse . . . for teachers, counselors, and other educational personnel . . ." The Committee Report states:

> In addition, the bill makes possible the utilization of paraprofessional community and neighborhood workers in "new career" type occupations in the drug abuse field. The new careers concept encourages identification of entry level employment opportunities and career ladders.
>
> In the area of drug abuse, para-professional neighborhood workers who have had personal experience with drug addiction in the neighborhood, can communicate with addicts and shed personal light on the problems of drug addiction, prevention and cure.

The Senate Education and Labor Committee is considering similar legislation.

## IV. HEALTH

President Johnson dealt directly with "Health Manpower" in his Message to Congress February 28, 1967 "Education and Health in America." He told Congress:

> The United States is facing a serious shortage of health manpower. Within the next decade this nation will need one million more health workers. If we are to meet this need, we must develop new skills and new types of health workers. We need short-term training programs for medical aides and other health workers . . .

### Health Manpower Act of 1968

On August 2, 1968 Congress completed its package of health manpower legislation in response to the President's proposal. Existing health manpower laws, primarily concerned with health professions, nursing, allied health professions, and public health, were revised and extended in an omnibus Health Manpower Act. None of this legislation contains specific New Careers or auxiliary personnel provisions, although several possibilities for such programs are created.

A major such possibility is in the section on "Special Project Grants" authorized "to assist schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, podiatry, and veterinary medicine", in addition to other activities, "to develop training for new levels or types of health professions personnel. . . ."

### The Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966:

On November 3, 1966, the President signed "The Allied Health Professions Training Act of 1966." This Act as Title III of the omnibus Health Manpower Act was extended through fiscal 1970. Although aimed at better professional training, this Act opens the way for grants related to "the training of new types of health technologists and technicians." The Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee report on this bill in 1966 quotes approvingly the statement of the National Commission on Progress "deploring the retention of traditional and basic training programs in the various health and medical fields" and calling for "training new categories of manpower who can perform many of the functions now carried out by highly skilled and scarce professional personnel."[20]

The 1968 Health Service Amendments to the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act provides support for staff and staff training of both professionals and technical personnel, with non-professional New Careers possibilities embedded in the technician training activities.

During 1969, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce held hearings on legislation dealing with community mental health and

20. U.S. Congress, 89th, U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Report No. 17222, **Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966**, October 13, 1966, pp. 3-4.

retardation centers, on grants to schools of public health, and on health services to migratory workers. Dr. Sheldon S. Steinberg of the University Research Corporation testified on behalf of New Careers in the hearings on Mental Health Centers. It is anticipated that major hearings will be conducted in 1970 on general health manpower. There is a need and an opportunity for much legislative progress on New Careers in this important area. Some confusion of jurisdiction between the House Labor and the House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee insofar as health nonprofessional manpower is concerned has somewhat impeded specific New Careers legislative action in this area, but this problem is being clarified.

**Vocational Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1968:**

A major and specific addition to the New Careers program is contained in the far-reaching amendments to the Vocational Rehabilitation Act unanimously approved by Congress on June 25, 1968. As the following language in the "Special Projects" section of these amendments makes clear, the VRA New Careers program has two dimensions. It aims both at using nonprofessional New Careerists in rehabilitation services and at creating New Careers job opportunities in public service for the handicapped served by vocational rehabilitation agencies. The Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare is authorized to:

make grants to State vocational rehabilitation agencies and other public and private nonprofit agencies to enable them to develop new programs to recruit and train individuals for new career opportunities in order to provide manpower in programs serving handicapped individuals and to upgrade or expand those services, and specifically calls for such grants to recruit and train handicapped individuals to provide them with new career opportunities in the fields of rehabilitation, health, welfare, public safety and law enforcement, and other appropriate public services employment.

The **Reports** of both the Senate and the House Labor Committee discuss this New Careers provision and significantly establish the legislative intent of the New Careers amendment as follows:

**New Career opportunities** — The committee recognizes the outstanding work being accomplished by the professionals in vocational rehabilitation. It also acknowledges that a disproportionate amount of their time is occupied by routine and clerical duties. In order to alleviate this condition and at the same time upgrade and expand existing services for nonprofessionals, funds have been authorized to be made available through grants to agencies working with the handicapped. In meeting their manpower needs, agencies should not be limited to employing handicapped individuals but should draw from the entire population of potential workers.

Furthermore, with this provision the committee seeks not only to fill manpower needs but to promote job development which offers New Careers opportunities and the promise of advancement. Grants should be allotted on the basis of the degree to which the new positions enhance an agency's capacity to improve services and the employees' potential for vertical progression.

The committee in recognizing the further needs of the handicapped has also included a new grant proposal for the recruitment and training of handicapped individuals in order to provide them with new career opportunities in the varied fields comprising public service employment.[21]

21. United States Congress, House of Representatives, Report No. 1346, **Vocational Rehabilitation Amendments of 1968**, May 2, 1968, p. 9. The Senate Committee **Report** repeated this statement.

## V. WELFARE

**Social Security Amendments of 1967:**

A number of New Careers development possibilities are to be found in the wide ranging 1967 amendments to the Social Security Act. The most significant of these is contained in the "Harris" Amendments to the Public Assistance sections of the law. Sponsored by Senator Fred R. Harris (D.Okla.), a new section entitled "Use of Subprofessional Staff and Volunteers in Providing Services to Individuals applying for and Receiving Assistance," requires that State plans be amended by July 1, 1969 to provide "for the training and effective use of paid subprofessional staff, with particular emphasis on the full-time or part time employment of recipients and other persons of low income, as community service aides, in the administration of the plan. . . ." This language is now inserted as a part of the Public Welfare Title of the Social Security Act in six separate sections of the law.

The Congressional rationale for this New Career opening was well stated by Senator Harris when he introduced his amendment on October 16, 1967:

I feel, Mr. President, that this country cannot begin to meet the health, education, welfare and other social needs of our people in the years ahead unless we provide for greatly expanded use of subprofessionals. We have made a bare beginning in this respect in some areas, such as health and education. These beginnings must be expanded and the concept of subprofessional staff must be broadened, not only in the welfare system, as my amendment attempts to do, but in many other agencies as well . . . *In no other way will we be able to meet the manpower needs in these fields. In no other way can we help make these programs as responsive as they must be to the needs of the people they serve.*[22] (italics added)

A number of other sections of the Social Security Act as amended in 1967 provide less specific but nonetheless potential openings for New Careers projects and programs. These include sections on Maternal and Child Health Services, Crippled Children Services and Trainees, and Child Welfare Services and Training Grants. "Special Project Grants for Dental Health of Children" authorize grants for research and "demonstration of the utilization of dental personnel with various levels of training." After describing the serious problems of inadequate dental care for poor children, the official analysis of this legislation states that

The critical shortage of dentists makes it impossible to establish a full-scale program immediately. To meet the need, the Nation will need to develop new systems of dental care and to train large numbers of auxiliary dental personnel to assist dentists . . . An important aspect of the program will be the provision of opportunities to train dental auxiliaries of all types and to develop improved training methods.[23]

**Work Incentive Program (WIN)**

The Work Incentive Program (WIN) established in the 1967 Social

22. **Congressional Record**, October 16, 1967, p. S 14819.

23. U.S. House of Representatives, 90th Congress, 1st Session, Committee on Ways and Means, "Section-by-Section Analysis and Explanation of Provisions of H.R. 5710, **The Social Security Amendments of 1967**, Feb. 20, 1967, pp. 40-41.

Security Act Amendments represents an extraordinary opening for New Careers programming. Under this provision, HEW and the Labor Department are to establish programs requiring all "appropriate" adults receiving aid to families with dependent children to participate in an "employability plan" of training and job placement. The WINS program directs that "to the extent practicable" the program should provide basic training, basic education, counseling, testing, work experience, job development and follow-up reviews necessary to "assist participants in securing and retaining employment and security possibilities for advancement."

Emphasis in the WIN guidelines issued by the U.S. Department of Labor is on "employment with a future." A major category of training outlined in the WIN program is for "Sub-professional Training . . . geared toward entry-level jobs in public service fields."[24]

While there are many problems and issues concerning the WIN program and its actual implementation, it seems clear that the perspective of shifting persons from welfare dependency to meaningful employment involved extensive application of New Careers concepts. The Labor Department has already arranged for technical assistance on New Careers to states and communities in their WIN programs. Moreover, in December, 1969, a workshop jointly sponsored by the U.S. Department of Labor, the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and the American Public Welfare Association focused on the New Careers potential of the WIN program.

The importance and potential of the "welfare" area to New Careers is outlined in the Nixon Administration's proposed Family Assistance Plan and the related proposals for extensive child care program development which would replace the current Aid to Families with Dependent Children welfare system.

### Family Assistance Act of 1969

The "Nixon Welfare Proposal," under the above title is now pending in Congress. Besides providing basic benefits to low-income families with children, it requires a training and employment program for "employable" adults in AFDC families. Without presuming to discuss the details of this proposal, the repeatedly stated objective is to train and prepare welfare recipients "in securing and retaining regular employment and having the opportunity for advancement in employment." Congressman James Scheuer (D-N.Y.) testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on the New Career import of the Family Assistance Plan. It is to be expected that this feature of the proposal will be further defined as Congressional action proceeds.

24. U.S. Department of Labor, **Work Incentive Program** (Revised, July 25, 1968) Section 212.3.

**Child Care Legislation**

The "Family Assistance Act of 1969" would provide for enormous extension of child care services. The Act calls for first year appropriations of $386,000,000 to provide child care to 450,000 needy children. Other legislation, notably the proposed "Comprehensive Pre-School and Child Day-Care Act of 1969" sponsored by Congressman John Brademas (D-Ind.), is pending in Congress and would vastly expand the child care system. Principal New Careers leaders including Dr. Frank Riessman of New York University, Dr. Jacob Fishman and Mrs. Paula Parks of the University Research Corporation, have already testified as to the importance of career development to meet the manpower and service needs of such an enlarged day-care program. It should be noted in this connection that the OEO — Headstart program now provides for career development in each project.

## VI. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT

Government employment presents the largest potential for New Careers in the U.S. Labor market. At the beginning of 1970 almost 13 million persons were employed by federal, state, and local governments — about 3,000,000 Federal employees, not including the Armed Forces, and almost 9,000,000 state and local employees. This reflects a strong and continuing upward trend in the absolute and relative importance of government employment.[25] Presumably such public employment is — or could become — particularly susceptible to public manpower policy seeking to develop New Careers opportunities for both unemployed and underemployed workers. Practically, however, to realize this potential will require widespread changes in Civil Service personnel policies and practices. These problems are beyond the scope of this paper, but it is very important to record that new legislative approaches to the Civil Service are under way and New Careers adjustments are on the agenda.

In a special message to Congress March 20, 1967 on "The Quality of American Government" President Johnson stressed the manpower problems of the public service with emphasis on the needs of state and local governments. The President asked for the enactment of two bills — the Public Service Education Act and the Intergovernmental Manpower Act. These bills are directed primarily at the problem of professional shortages and the need to upgrade existing government personnel. No specific New Careers features were indicated. These bills were introduced and assigned to the Senate Committee on Government Operations and the House Education and Labor Committee. They illustrate an especially important area of potential New Careers programming.

### Intergovernmental Personnel Act of 1969

This Johnson administration bill of the above title was introduced in the House on April 6, 1967 by Rep. John Brademas (D.-Ind.) and in the Senate on April 11, 1967 by Sen. Edmund S. Muskie (D.-Maine) H.R. 8234 and S.1485. Its principal provisions as described by Rep. Brademas are:

> This bill would provide Federal financial and other assistance to State and local governments to train and improve administrative personnel . . . Federal agencies would be authorized to admit State and local employees to training programs for Federal grant programs. The Civil Service Commission would be authorized to make grants covering up to 75 percent of the cost to assist State and local governments to establish and carry out comprehensive in-service training programs and to strengthen personnel administration. . . .[26]

In 1969 this same legislation with only minor revisions was introduced by Senator Muskie (D.-Me.) and Congressman William Moorhead (D.-

25. "Between 1955 and 1965, State and local government employment increased from 4.7 to 7.7 million persons. This is a 63% increase — a rate of growth four times that of the U.S. economy as a whole and seven times that for Federal employment. **Congressional Record**, April 11, 1967, p. S-4810, Statement by Senator Muskie (D. Maine).

26. **Congressional Record**, April 6, 1967, p. H. 3677.

Penna.). The Muskie bill, S.11, was passed by the Senate on October 27, 1969 and its counterpart is pending in the House Labor Committee. Among the various objectives contained in this legislation as enacted by the Senate are "strengthening the recruitment, selection, assignment, and development of handicapped persons, women, and members of disadvantaged groups whose capacities are not being utilized fully."

**Other Government Related Proposals**

Several other legislative proposals, and the developing Public Service Careers Program initiated in 1969 by the U.S. Department of Labor, illustrate the central role of governmental employment for New Careers — and vice versa. Two illustrative legislative proposals are:

**Federal Government Employment Opportunity Act**

Senator Joseph Tydings (D.-Md.) on March 22, 1967 introduced S.1361 "to authorize a Federal Government employment opportunity program for unskilled and semiskilled individuals." A similar companion bill, S.1360, would establish the same program in the District of Columbia. Eight other Senators sponsored these bills which were referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Senator Tydings' bill makes the declaration that it is:

> the policy of Congress that all departments and agencies of the Federal Government shall, to the maximum degree practicable, conduct programs of recruitment and develop training programs for unskilled, subprofessional, and subtechnical job categories within the Government employment structure, and to develop and utilize fully the skill potentials of unskilled and low-skilled Government employees . . .

The Civil Service Commission is directed to identify job classifications "where functions performed . . . could appropriately be performed by subprofessionals or subtechnical personnel (and) establish new subprofessional or subtechnical job classifications. . . ." Programs for recruitment and training of unskilled or low-skilled workers "for specific classified civil service employment" would be required.

**Public Service Employment Opportunity Act**

Following the 1967 Senate hearings on the Federal Role in Urban Affairs, Senator Ribicoff (D.-Conn.) introduced a series of bills, including S.585, "to provide meaningful public service employment opportunities to unemployed individuals with serious competitive disadvantages." The bill is aimed at job creation and would authorize $2 billion to provide jobs for hard core unemployed to meet "public service needs in parks, streets, slums, countryside, schools and colleges, hospitals, nursing homes and

rest homes. . . ." Although not a Civil Service nor a New Careers measure, this bill is relevant to the New Careers program in government employment.

**Public Service Careers Program**

In August, 1969, the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor announced the Public Service Careers Program. This program is described as "a new manpower program created to secure, within merit principles, permanent employment for the disadvantaged in public service agencies and to stimulate upgrading of current employees, thereby meeting public sector manpower needs."[27] Funds and project support are provided under four separate "plans": **Plan A**, Entry and Upgrading in State, County and Local Governments; **Plan B**, Employment and Upgrading in Grant-in-Aid Programs; **Plan C**, New Careers in Human Services (The Scheuer — OEO Program) and **Plan D**, Entry and Upgrading in the Federal Service. Fifty million dollars was declared to be available to initiate this program. Labor Department officials described it as an extension of New Careers concepts into the civil service area. At the end of 1969, its implementation was just beginning.

27. U.S. Department of Labor, **Public Service Careers Program: A General Description**, August 1969, p. 1.

## VI. GENERAL MANPOWER LEGISLATION

Every piece of legislation proposed in Congress which deals with manpower and personnel has the potentiality of being related to New Careers purposes. In particular all general manpower legislation, whether relating to training, placement, job development, or overall program coordination is subject to adjustment for New Careers purposes. This is apparent in the major manpower legislation now pending and headed for major attention by Congress in 1970, i.e., President Nixon's Manpower proposal and the major Democratic alternative, "The Manpower Act" proposed by Congressman James O'Hara (D.-Mich.) and many other House Democrats.

### President Nixon's Manpower Program

President Nixon opened his August 12, 1969, message to Congress on Manpower policy with "new careers" language, saying:

A job is one rung on the lifelong career of work. That is why we must look at manpower training with new eyes: as a continuing process to help people get started in a job and to get ahead in a career.

The President called for manpower training that will "discover the potential in those people who are now considered unemployable, removing many of the barriers now blocking their way." Specifically President Nixon described his proposed Manpower Act as "Creating a career development plan for trainees, tailored to suit their individual capabilities and ambitions" and providing "a combination of services that would help them (eligible applicants) to train, to find work, and to move on up the ladder."

The Administration Manpower legislation introduced by Senator Jacob Javits (R.-NY) and Congressman William H. Ayres (R.-Ohio) — S.2838 and HR.13472 — implements this Presidential message.

### O'Hara Bill — "The Manpower Act"

The Democratic alternative to the Nixon proposal has been sponsored by Congressman James O'Hara (D.-Mich.) and is pending before the House Committee on Education and Labor. Both the Democratic and Republican proposals will be the subject of major Congressional attention in 1970.

The O'Hara bill (HR.11620) includes the following New Careers proposal as one of the "components of Manpower Services Programs":

Special programs for jobs leading to career opportunities including new types of careers, in programs designed to improve the physical, social, economic, or cultural conditions of the community or area served in fields including but not limited to health, education, welfare, neighborhood redevelopment, and public safety, which provide maximum prospects for advancement and continued employment without Federal assistance, which gives promise of contributing to the broader adoption of new methods of providing job ladder opportunities, and which provide opportunities for further occupational training to facilitate career advancement.

In addition, the O'Hara Bill includes special "Title III Public Service Employment" which provides for a wide program assuring "useful public service employment to unemployed persons." This is the principle issue between the Republican and Democratic manpower plans, since it involves extensive job creation on the part of the Federal government. Obviously, the implications for New Careers of a large public service job creation program as urged by Congressman O'Hara are enormous.

The prospect of general manpower legislative deliberations and action by Congress in 1970 represents a most important New Careers legislative potentiality in the immediate future.

## CONCLUSION

Legislative opportunities for advancing the New Careers program are numerous and great. The variety of the legislative areas to which the New Careers program relates gives a great opportunity for increased appreciation and application of the program. This diversity also presents a problem if the standards of a New Careers program — opportunities for advancement, no dead-end jobs, structural integration into the total manpower organization, adequate training while at work, maintenance of decent pay and work standards, avoidance of "ghettoization" of jobs and public services, and job opportunities for the poor — are not to be undermined. To maintain these standards while advancing the magnitude of the New Careers program will require vigilance on many fronts. But properly used, these diverse New Careers programs can help pave the way to a comprehensive national New Careers program in which growth and the integrity of the program are both achieved.

ERIC Clearinghouse
JUL 17 1970
on Adult Education